

Tanks in Gundlupet Taluk (Improvement).

Q.—567. Sri H. K. SHIVA
RUDRAPPA (Gundlupet-Heggadade-
vankote).—

Will the Government be pleased to
state:—

the action taken by them in the
matter of improving the following
tanks in Gundlupet Taluk and the
stage in which they are:—

- (i) Bombalapuradakere,
- (ii) Devarahallikere,
- (iii) Somahallikere,
- (iv) Halladamadahallikere,
- (v) Malavallikere,
- (vi) Naluru Amanikere?

A.—Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minis-
ter for Revenue and Public Works).—

- (i) Bombalapuradakere—

A revised estimate has been
got up for the work.

- (ii) Devarahallikere—

An estimate for the work has
been prepared.

- (iii) Somahallikere—

Proposals for improving the
tank have been called for.

- (iv) Halladamadahallikere—

Sanction to the estimate for
the work is under considera-
tion.

- (v) Malavallikere—

There is no tank by this name
but a breached tank by name
Malavalli Guruva Setty katte
is being proposed for improve-
ments.

- (vi) Nalur Amanikere—

Proposals for improving the
tank have been called for.

Electricity (Supply to Villages).

Q.—612. Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA
(Turuvekere).—

Will the Government be pleased to
state:—

(a) the number of villages electri-
fied in the State;

(b) the percentage of villages
electrified out of the total number of
villages in the State?

A.—Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA (Minister
for Agriculture).

(a) 588 (to end of September
1954).

(b) 3.47 per cent.

Anti-Corruption Department (Action taken on Complaints in Tumkur District).

Q.—633. Sri C. M. ANNAYYAPPA
(Gubbi).—

Will the Government be pleased to
state:—

(a) the number of petitions
received by the Anti-Corruption Depart-
ment from each taluk of Tumkur
District;

(b) of them, (i) the number of
signed petitions; (ii) the number of
signatures affixed, and (iii) the taluks
to which they pertain;

(c) (i) the officers of the several
departments against whom anonymous
petitions have been received from
Gubbi taluk; (ii) the number of signed
petitions received; (iii) the action
taken against each officer on the basis
of these petitions?

A.—Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minis-
ter for Revenue and Public Works).—

(a)	1. Tumkur Taluk	...	190
	2. Madhugiri Taluk	...	55
	3. Gubbi Taluk	...	46
	4. Sira Taluk	...	46
	5. Turuvekere Taluk	...	37
	6. Tiptur Taluk	...	64
	7. Kunigal Taluk	...	72
	8. Pavagada Taluk	...	37
	9. Chiknaikanahalli Taluk	...	33
	10. Koratagere Taluk	...	30

(b) (i) 385.

(ii) The information is not
available.

(iii) Tumkur Taluk	...	130
Madhugiri Taluk		37
Gubbi Taluk	...	29
Sira Taluk		26
Turuvekere Taluk	...	24
Tiptur Taluk	...	39
Kunigal Taluk	...	48
Pavagada Taluk	..	23
Chiknaikanahalli Taluk.	...	17
Koratagere Taluk	...	12
Total	...	385

Departments—

(c) (i) Revenue	..	8 officers
Police	...	2 "
Agriculture	...	1 officer
Public Works		7 officers
Registration	...	1 officer
Education	...	1 "
Insurance	...	1 "

(ii) 29.

(iii) One Revenue Inspector was dismissed; one Special Revenue Inspector was posted as Clerk and reduced by Rs. 5; three Revenue Inspectors, one Amildar and two Fieldmen of the Agricultural Department were warned; the services of one Agricultural Inspector and one Salesman were terminated, the amount misappropriated by them (the latter two) being ordered to be recovered.

Speaker's Ruling on Point of Order with Respect to Cattle Trespass Bill, 1954

MR. SPEAKER.—On the 20th instant when the motion for consideration of the Cattle Trespass (Amendment) Bill, 1954 was proposed to be made, some Hon'ble Members objected to the making of the motion on the ground that the Statement of Objects and Reasons accompanying the Bill bore no relation to the Bill as laid on the Table of this House and that thereafter this Bill should not be proceeded with. I stated that I would consider this matter and give a ruling later.

A perusal of the Rules of Procedure indicates that it is only in the case of Bills originating in this House that the

Bill is required to be accompanied by a Statement of Objects and Reasons. The Cattle Trespass (Amendment) Bill did not originate in this House. It was introduced in the other House and passed by that House after certain amendments were made in the original Bill. The Bill as passed by the Council was thereafter laid on the Table of this House as required by rule 90-F. This rule merely requires that the Bill as passed by the Council shall be laid on the Table of the House and does not say anything about a Statement of Objects and Reasons. In the several Legislatures in India the practice in this matter appears to differ. In some Legislatures the Bill as passed by the originating chamber together with the Statement of Objects and Reasons is laid on the Table of the other House. This is done though the Bill may have undergone extensive changes in the originating chamber so that the Statement of Objects and Reasons does not correctly indicate the purposes of the Bill as it emerges from the originating House. In certain other Legislatures the Bill as passed by one House is laid on the table of the other without the Statement of Objects and Reasons.

So far as we are concerned in Mysore, the practice has been to lay on the Table of one House the Bill as passed by the other accompanied by the Statement of Objects and Reasons as it was originally appended to the Bill. This was intended to give the members of the House an idea of the purposes underlying the Bill when it was first introduced in the other House. It was felt that to merely lay the Bill unaccompanied by such a Statement would deprive members of such information, whatever it may be worth. However, it is desirable that the Government should always amend the Statement of Objects and Reasons in conformity with the amendments effected by the originating House before taking it up in the other House. I shall also get this question examined again.

It must however be stated that, as a Statement of Objects and Reasons is not part of the Bill, there can be no